

Noncommutative gravity: fuzzy sphere and others

YASUHIRO ABE and V. P. NAIR

*Physics Department
City College of the CUNY
New York, NY 10031*

E-mail: abe@sci.ccny.cuny.edu
vpn@sci.ccny.cuny.edu

Abstract

Gravity on noncommutative analogues of compact spaces can give a finite mode truncation of ordinary commutative gravity. We obtain the actions for gravity on the noncommutative two-sphere and on the noncommutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$ in terms of finite dimensional $(N \times N)$ -matrices. The commutative large N limit is also discussed.

1 Introduction

There has recently been a lot of interest in physics on noncommutative spaces, partly motivated by the discovery that noncommutative spaces can arise as solutions in string and M -theories [1]. In the matrix model version of M -theory [2], noncommutative spaces can be obtained as $(N \times N)$ -matrix configurations whose large N -limit will give smooth manifolds [3]. Fluctuations of branes are described by gauge theories and, with this motivation, there has recently been a large number of papers dealing with gauge theories, and more generally field theories, on such spaces [1]. There is also an earlier line of development, motivated by quantum gravity, using the Dirac operator to characterize the manifold and using ‘spectral actions’ [4].

Even apart from their string and M -theory connections, noncommutative spaces are interesting for other reasons. Many of the noncommutative spaces recently discussed have an underlying Heisenberg algebra for the different coordinates. A Lie algebra structure is more natural from the matrix model point of view; these typically lead to noncommutative analogues of compact spaces. Because these spaces are described by finite dimensional matrices, the number of possible modes for fields on such spaces is limited and so one has a natural ultraviolet cutoff. We may think of such field theories as a finite mode approximation to commutative continuum field theories, providing, in some sense, an alternative to lattice gauge theories. Indeed, this point of view has been pursued in some recent work [5]. While lattice gauge theories may be most simply described by standard hypercubic lattices, gravity is one case where the noncommutative approach can be significantly better. This can provide a regularized gravity theory preserving the various desirable symmetries, which is hard to do with standard lattice versions. It would be an interesting alternative to the Regge calculus, which is essentially the only finite-mode-truncation of gravity known with the concept of coordinate invariance built in. A finite-mode-truncation is not quantum gravity, but it can give a formulation of standard gravity where questions can be posed and answered in a well defined way.

Partly with this motivation, we have recently suggested a version of gravity on noncommutative spaces [6]. This led to an action for even dimensional, in particular four-dimensional, noncommutative spaces generalizing the Chang-MacDowell-Mansouri approach used for commutative four-dimensional gravity [7]. (Some further developments somewhat related to this analysis, as well as different approaches, can be traced from reference [8].) In this paper, we will consider the case of the fuzzy sphere in some detail, setting up the required structures, eventually obtaining an action for gravity in terms of finite dimensional matrices. The large N -limit of the action will give the usual action for gravitational fields on S^2 . Some of the physically interesting questions related to this framework, such as the computation of correlators, are currently under study. We also construct the finite dimensional matrix model action for gravity on noncommutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$ and indicate how this may be generalized to $\mathbf{CP}^n$.

It would also be interesting to extend some of this analysis to other two-dimensional non-commutative spaces which have finite number of degrees of freedom such as noncommutative Riemann surfaces [9].

2 Derivatives, vectors, etc.

We shall primarily be concerned with noncommutative (NC) versions of coset spaces of the form G/H for some compact Lie group G , H being a subgroup of G . Most of our discussion will be based on $S^2 = SU(2)/U(1)$. Functions on the NC sphere are given by $(N \times N)$ -matrices with elements f_{mn} . A particular way of representing such functions was given in [6] as

$$f(g, g') = \langle g | \hat{f} | g' \rangle = \sum_{mn} f_{mn} \mathcal{D}_{mj}^{*(j)}(g) \mathcal{D}_{nj}^{(j)}(g') \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{mk}^{(j)}(g)$ are the Wigner $\mathcal{D}$ -functions for $SU(2)$ belonging to the spin- j representation. Here $N = 2j + 1$. In this way of representing functions, derivatives can be realized as the right translation operators K_a on g ,

$$K_a \cdot \mathcal{D}_{mk}^{(j)}(g) = \left[\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(g t_a) \right]_{mk} \quad (2)$$

Here $t_a = \sigma_a/2$, σ_a being the Pauli matrices. However, to realize various quantities, the action in particular, purely in terms of matrices, we will introduce a different but related way of defining derivatives, vectors, tensors, etc., on a fuzzy coset space.

Let g denote an element of the group G and define

$$S_{Aa} = 2 \operatorname{Tr}(g^{-1} t_A g t_a) \quad (3)$$

where t_a and t_A are hermitian matrices forming a basis of the Lie algebra of G in the fundamental representation. We normalize these by $\operatorname{Tr}(t_a t_b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab}$, $\operatorname{Tr}(t_A t_B) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{AB}$. (the distinction between upper and lower case indices is only for clarity in what follows.) For $SU(2)$, $a, A = 1, 2, 3$ and S_{Aa} obey the relations

$$\begin{aligned} S_{Aa} S_{Ab} &= \delta_{ab} \\ S_{Aa} S_{Ba} &= \delta_{AB} \\ \epsilon_{ABC} S_{Aa} S_{Bb} &= \epsilon_{abc} S_{Cc} \\ \epsilon_{abc} S_{Aa} S_{Bb} &= \epsilon_{ABC} S_{Cc} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Let L_A be the $(N \times N)$ -matrix representation of the $SU(2)$ generators, obeying the commutation rules $[L_A, L_B] = i\epsilon_{ABC} L_C$. We then define the operators

$$\mathcal{K}_a = S_{Aa} L_A - \frac{1}{2} K_a \quad (5)$$

where K_a are the right translation operators, $K_a g = g t_a$. One can think of them as differential operators, $K_a = i(E^{-1})_a^i (\partial/\partial\varphi^i)$, in terms of the group parameters φ^i , $g^{-1}dg = (-it_a)E_i^a d\varphi^i$. K_a obey the commutation rules $[K_a, K_b] = i\epsilon_{abc}K_c$. We then find

$$[\mathcal{K}_a, \mathcal{K}_b] = \frac{i}{4}\epsilon_{abc} K_c \quad (6)$$

Identifying the $U(1)$ subgroup generated by t_3 as the H -subgroup, we define derivatives on the fuzzy S^2 as $\mathcal{K}_\pm = \mathcal{K}_1 \pm i\mathcal{K}_2$. Notice that this is a hybrid object, being partially a matrix commutator and partially something that depends on the continuous variable g . This is very convenient for our purpose and in the end g will be integrated over anyway.

We now define a function f on NC S^2 as an $(N \times N)$ -matrix with no g -dependence. The derivative of f is then given as

$$\mathcal{K}_\mu \cdot f \equiv [\mathcal{K}_\mu, f] = S_{a\mu}[L_A, f] \quad (7)$$

$\mu = \pm$. Since $[\mathcal{K}_+, \mathcal{K}_-] = \frac{1}{2} K_3$ from (6), we find $[\mathcal{K}_+, \mathcal{K}_-] \cdot f = 0$, consistent with the expectation that derivatives commute when acting on a function. Equation (7) also shows that it is natural to define a vector on NC S^2 as

$$V_\mu = S_{A\mu} V_A \quad (8)$$

where V_A are three $(N \times N)$ -matrices. On a two-sphere, a vector should only have two independent components, so this is one too many and V_A must obey a constraint. Notice that the quantity $[L_A, f]$ obeys the condition $L_A[L_A, f] + [L_A, f]L_A = 0$, since $L_A L_A$ is proportional to the identity matrix. This suggests that the correct constraint for a general vector is $L_A V_A + V_A L_A = 0$. In the large N -limit, since L_A become proportional to x_A , the commutative coordinates of the two-sphere as embedded in $\mathbf{R}^3$ (with $x_A x_A = 1$), the condition $x \cdot V = 0$ is exactly what we need to restrict the vectors to directions tangential to the sphere. We may thus regard $L_A V_A + V_A L_A = 0$ as the appropriate NC version. As we shall see below this constraint will also emerge naturally when we define integrals on NC S^2 . Using

$$[K_a, S_{Ab}] = i\epsilon_{abc}S_{Ac} \quad (9)$$

we find

$$[\mathcal{K}_+, \mathcal{K}_-] \cdot V_\pm = \pm \frac{1}{2} V_\pm \quad (10)$$

which is consistent with the Riemann curvature of S^2 , $R_{+-+}^+ = -R_{-+-}^- = \frac{1}{2}$. Higher rank tensors may also be defined in an analogous way with several S_{Aa} 's, $T_{\mu_1\mu_2\cdots\mu_r} = S_{A_1\mu_1}S_{A_2\mu_2}\cdots S_{A_r\mu_r} T_{A_1A_2\cdots A_r}$.

We now turn to a definition of ‘integration’ on the NC S^2 . We will only need, and will only define, integration of the NC analogue of an antisymmetric rank-2 tensor or a two-form. Such a quantity has components of the form $W_{+-} = (S_{A+}S_{B-} - S_{A-}S_{B+})W_{AB}$. By

the properties of S_{Aa} , $S_{A+}S_{B-} - S_{A-}S_{B+} = -2i\epsilon_{ABC}S_{C3}$. Integration of W_{+-} over g (with the trace of the matrices W_{AB}) will give zero. To get a nonzero integral we must introduce a density factor ρ . Such a factor must commute with K_3 to be properly defined on $SU(2)/U(1)$ and must give nonzero upon g -integration with S_{C3} . The only choice is $\rho = \frac{1}{3}S_{K3}L_K$. The appearance of such a density factor is actually very natural. If we consider a commutative S^2 embedded in $\mathbf{R}^3$ with coordinates x_A , then $x_A = S_{A3}$ in a suitable parametrization. The usual volume element is oriented along $x_A = S_{A3}$ and so we can expect a factor $\rho = \frac{1}{3}S_{K3}L_K$ in the NC case. With the introduction of the factor ρ , we can consider an ‘integral’ of the form $\int_g \text{Tr}(\rho W)$. However, if we consider $\int_g \text{Tr}(\rho W f)$ where f is a function, we do not have the expected cyclicity property since $[\rho, f] \neq 0$ in general. Cyclicity property can be obtained if we symmetrize the factors inside the trace except the density factor ρ . Gathering these points, we now define an ‘integral’ over NC S^2 , denoted by, $\int$, as follows.

$$\int A_1 A_2 \cdots A_l = \int_g \text{Tr} \left[\rho \frac{1}{l} \sum_{\text{cycl.}} (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_l) \right] \quad (11)$$

where $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_l$ are functions, vectors, tensors, etc., such that the product is an anti-symmetric rank-2 tensor (of the form W_{+-}), a NC analogue of a two-form. The summation in (11) is over cyclic permutations of the arguments.

In a similar fashion, let us consider now a NC analogue of an exterior derivative, in particular, the analogue of a two-form corresponding to the curl of a vector $V_\mu = S_{A\mu}V_A$, $\mu = \pm$. Since we have defined $\mathcal{K}_\pm$ as derivatives on NC S^2 , a NC analogue of such a term can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} dV &\equiv [\mathcal{K}_+, V_-] - [\mathcal{K}_-, V_+] \\ &= (S_{A+}S_{B-} - S_{A-}S_{B+}) [L_A, V_B] - 2S_{C3}V_C \\ &= (-2i) S_{C3} (\epsilon_{ABC} [L_A, V_B] - iV_C) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

If h is a function on NC S^2 , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} V dh &\equiv V_+ [\mathcal{K}_-, h] - V_- [\mathcal{K}_+, h] \\ &= (-2i)\epsilon_{ABC} S_{C3} V_A [L_B, h] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Using the definition of the integral (11) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int dV h &= (-2i) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[L_K \{ \epsilon_{ABC} [L_A, V_B] - iV_C \} h + \{ \epsilon_{ABC} [L_A, V_B] - iV_C \} L_K h \right] \\ &\quad \times \int_g \frac{1}{3} S_{K3} S_{C3} \\ &= (-2i) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[L_C \{ \epsilon_{ABC} [L_A, V_B] - iV_C \} h + \{ \epsilon_{ABC} [L_A, V_B] - iV_C \} L_C h \right] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where we used $\int_g S_{K3} S_{C3} = 3\delta_{KC}$. Similarly we have

$$\left[\int V dh = (-2i) \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[\epsilon_{ABC} (L_C V_A + V_A L_C) [L_B, h] \right] \right] \quad (15)$$

By using cyclicity of the trace for the finite dimensional matrices L_A, V_B, h , etc., we find that the desired partial integration property

$$\left[\int dV h = \left[\int V dh \right] \right] \quad (16)$$

holds if V_A obey the constraint

$$L_A V_A + V_A L_A = 0 \quad (17)$$

This relation, which was introduced earlier, is now seen, based on integration properties, to be the correct constraint for vectors. When V_A are gauge fields, this constraint will have to be slightly modified for reasons of gauge invariance, as will be seen in the next section.

3 Action for gravity on NC S^2

We are now in a position to discuss actions for gravity on NC S^2 . As outlined in [6], we introduce the gauge field

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\mu &= \mathcal{A}_\mu^A I^A = e_\mu^a I^a + \Omega_\mu^3 I^3 + \Omega_\mu^0 I^0 \\ &= e_\mu^+ I^+ + e_\mu^- I^- + \Omega_\mu^3 I^3 + \Omega_\mu^0 I^0 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The components $(\Omega_\mu^0, \Omega_\mu^3, e_\mu^a)$ are vectors on NC S^2 as defined in the previous section. The upper indices of these vectors correspond to components for the Lie algebra of $U(2)$, (I^0, I^3, I^a) , $a = \pm$, form the (2×2) -representation of $U(2)$. Specifically, in terms of the Pauli matrices σ_i , $I^0 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$, $I^3 = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_3$, $I^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 \pm i\sigma_2)$. $\mathcal{A}_\mu$ is thus a vector on NC S^2 which also takes values in the Lie algebra of $U(2)$. This $U(2)$ is the group acting on the upper indices of $\mathcal{A}_\mu$ or the tangent frame indices. Notice that, with L_A , K_a and the I 's, we have three different actions for $SU(2)$. In terms of $\mathcal{A}_\mu$ we now define

$$[\mathcal{K}_\mu + \mathcal{A}_\mu, \mathcal{K}_\nu + \mathcal{A}_\nu] = \frac{i}{4} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha} K_\alpha + F_{\mu\nu} \quad (19)$$

In our description, gravity is parametrized in terms of deviations from S^2 . The vectors e_μ^a ($a = \pm$) are the frame fields for this and Ω_μ^α ($\alpha = 0, 3$) are the spin connections. As opposed to the commutative case, there can in general be a connection for the I^0 component, since we need the full $U(2)$ to form NC gauge fields. One can expand $F_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\nu}^0 I^0 + \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}^3 I^3 + \mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}^a I^a \quad (20)$$

$T_{\mu\nu}^a$ is the torsion tensor. On commutative S^2 , $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}^3$ is of the form $R_{\mu\nu}(\Omega) + 2(e_\mu^+ e_\nu^- - e_\mu^- e_\nu^+)$ where $R_{\mu\nu}(\Omega)$ is the Riemann tensor. For NC S^2 , the expression for $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}^3$ is a little more involved.

In defining an action, we will use our prescription for the integral. The gauging of $\mathcal{K}_\mu$ is equivalent to the gauging $L_a \rightarrow L_A + \mathcal{A}_A$. Thus we must also change our definition of ρ to $\rho = \frac{1}{3}S_3^K(L_K + \mathcal{A}_K)$. The constraint (17) is now replaced by

$$(L_A + \mathcal{A}_A)(L_A + \mathcal{A}_A) = L_A L_A \quad (21)$$

($\mathcal{A}_A$ is expanded in terms of the I^a as in (18).) This equation was first proposed in [10] as the correct condition to be used for gauge fields.

The data for gravity is presented in the form of a gauge field and the action suggested in [6], generalizing the McDowell-Mansouri approach for commutative gravity, is

$$\mathcal{S} = \alpha \int \text{tr}(QF) \quad (22)$$

Here tr denotes the trace over the I 's regarded as (2×2) -matrices. For higher even dimensional cases it would be $\int \text{tr}(QFF\dots F)$, where Q is a combination of the I 's which commutes with the H -subgroup of G , $G = U(2)$ for the present case; for NC S^2 , $Q = I^3$. However, unlike the case of four and higher dimensions, $\int \text{tr}(I^3 F)$ vanishes, which is the NC analogue of the statement that the two-dimensional Einstein-Hilbert action $\int R\sqrt{g}$ is a topological invariant. As noted in the commutative context, we must use a Lagrange multiplier scalar field η to obtain nontrivial actions. In the present case, the analogous action is

$$\mathcal{S} = \alpha \int \text{tr}(I^3 \eta F) \quad (23)$$

Here $\eta = \eta^0 I^0 + \eta^3 I^3 + \eta^+ I^+ + \eta^- I^-$, ($\eta^0, \eta^3, \eta^\pm$) being scalar functions on NC S^2 . Using the decomposition (20) for the field strength, we can simplify this expression as

$$\mathcal{S} = -i\frac{\alpha}{2}\text{Tr}\left[I^3\eta[(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)F_C + F_C(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)]\right] \quad (24)$$

where $F_C = F_C^0 I^0 + F_C^3 I^3 + F_C^+ I^+ + F_C^- I^-$,

$$F_C^0 = \frac{1}{2}\left\{[L_A, \Omega_B^0] + \frac{1}{2}(\Omega_A^0 \Omega_B^0 + \Omega_A^3 \Omega_B^3) + (e_A^+ e_B^- + e_A^- e_B^+)\right\}\epsilon_{ABC} - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_C^0 \quad (25)$$

$$F_C^3 = \frac{1}{2}\left\{[L_A, \Omega_B^3] + \frac{1}{2}(\Omega_A^0 \Omega_B^3 + \Omega_A^3 \Omega_B^0) + (e_A^+ e_B^- - e_A^- e_B^+)\right\}\epsilon_{ABC} - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_C^3 \quad (26)$$

$$F_C^- = \frac{1}{2}\left\{[L_A, e_B^-] + \frac{1}{2}e_A^-(\Omega_B^0 + \Omega_B^3) - \frac{1}{2}(\Omega_B^0 - \Omega_B^3)e_A^-\right\}\epsilon_{ABC} - \frac{i}{2}e_C^- \quad (27)$$

$$F_C^+ = \frac{1}{2}\left\{[L_A, e_B^+] + \frac{1}{2}e_A^+(\Omega_B^0 - \Omega_B^3) - \frac{1}{2}(\Omega_B^0 + \Omega_B^3)e_A^+\right\}\epsilon_{ABC} - \frac{i}{2}e_C^+ \quad (28)$$

Equation (24), with (25-28), is the action for gravity on the NC S^2 . They are expressed entirely in terms of finite dimensional $(N \times N)$ -matrices, L_A, e_A^a , and Ω_A^α . As mentioned earlier, this action can give us an alternative to the Regge calculus, and, in principle, we can calculate many interesting physical quantities, correlation functions in particular, from (24)-(28) by analyzing it as a matrix model. In this paper, however, we shall not calculate correlators. Instead, we shall analyze the action a bit further and discuss the commutative limit in what follows.

Variations of the action with respect to η 's then provide the four equations of motion,

$$\mathcal{F}^a \equiv [(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)F_C + F_C(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)]^a = 0 \quad (29)$$

for $a = 0, 3, \pm$. The components $a = \pm$ correspond to the vanishing of torsion. $\mathcal{F}^3$ is not quite the Riemann tensor associated with Ω^3 , due to the e^+e^- -term. The vanishing of $\mathcal{F}^3$ shows that the Riemann tensor is proportional to the e^+e^- -term.

There are also equations of motion associated with the variation of the $e^\pm$, Ω^3 , Ω^0 , which are coupled equations for the four η 's. We will not write them out here, they can be easily worked out from the expressions (25-28) for the F_C 's. Notice however that one solution of the equations of motion is easy to find. The variation of the action with respect to the $e^\pm$, Ω^3 , Ω^0 is of the form

$$\delta\mathcal{S} = -i\frac{\alpha}{2}\text{Tr}\left[I^3\eta\delta[(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)F_C + F_C(L_C + \mathcal{A}_C)]\right] \quad (30)$$

Thus $\eta = 0$ is evidently a solution.

The equations for the connections $e^\pm$, Ω^3 , Ω^0 in (29) are also solved by setting all $F_{\mu\nu}$ to zero. This corresponds to the choice $\mathcal{A}_\mu = S_{B\mu}\mathcal{A}_B$, $\mathcal{A}_B = iU^{-1}[L_B, U]$ where U is a matrix which is an element of $U(N) \otimes U(2)$, L_B is viewed as $L^A \otimes \mathbf{1}$. In other words, it is an element of $U(2)$ with parameters which are $(N \times N)$ -matrices. This corresponds to the NC S^2 itself.

4 Commutative limit

We now consider the commutative limit of the action obtained in the previous section; this can be realized by taking a large N limit. In this section, we will take the dimension of matrices L_A 's as $N + 1$, rather than N . The large N -limit can be taken easily by writing the L_A 's as follows [11].

$$\begin{aligned} L_+ &= \frac{N+2}{2}\phi_+ + z^2\partial_z & \phi_+ &= \frac{2z}{1+z\bar{z}} \\ L_- &= \frac{N+2}{2}\phi_- - \partial_z & \phi_- &= \frac{2\bar{z}}{1+z\bar{z}} \\ L_3 &= \frac{N+2}{2}\phi_3 + z\partial_z & \phi_3 &= \frac{1-z\bar{z}}{1+z\bar{z}} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

A basis of states on which L_A act is given by $|\alpha\rangle$, $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, N$ with $\langle z|\alpha\rangle = 1, z, \dots, z^N$. If we choose such a basis the vectors, Ω and e , can be considered as functions of $z, \bar{z}$. The commutative limit can then be taken by the following replacements.

$$\begin{aligned}
L_A &\longrightarrow \frac{N+2}{2}\phi_A \\
[L_A, \Omega_B] &\longrightarrow \frac{1}{N+1} \left\{ \frac{N+2}{2}\phi_A, \Omega_B \right\} \\
&= \frac{N+2}{2} \frac{1}{N+1} (1 + z\bar{z})^2 (\partial\phi_A \bar{\partial}\Omega_B - \bar{\partial}\phi_A \partial\Omega_B) \\
&= \frac{N+2}{2} \frac{1}{N+1} k_A \Omega_B
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where $\partial = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, $\bar{\partial} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}$ and the operators k_A are given in the appendix. The replacement of a commutator with a Poisson bracket is analogous to the passage from the quantum theory to the classical theory, $1/(N+1)$ serving as the analogue of Planck's constant. Notice also that, in the expression $L_A + \mathcal{A}_A$, the term L_A dominates in the large N limit. The formulae given above and the passage to the large N -limit can be best seen by geometrical quantization of S^2 .

It is instructive to consider the large N -limit of one of the terms in the action, say the term involving η^0 in some detail. Denoting this term as $\mathcal{S}[\eta^0]$ and using (32), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}[\eta^0] &= -i\frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{N+2}{2} \right) \epsilon_{ABC} \text{Tr} \left[\eta^0 \left[\frac{N+2}{2(N+1)} \phi_C k_A \Omega_B^3 + \phi_C (e_A^+ e_B^- - e_A^- e_B^+) \right] + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right] \\
&\approx -i\beta \frac{1}{N+1} \epsilon_{ABC} \text{Tr} \left[\eta^0 \phi_C \left[\frac{1}{2} k_A \Omega_B^3 + (e_A^+ e_B^- - e_A^- e_B^+) \right] + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Here $\beta = \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{N+2}{2} \right) (N+1)$. This will be taken as an N -independent constant. In carrying out these simplifications, it is useful to keep in mind that the Ω_A obey the constraint

$$\phi_A \Omega_A + \Omega_A \phi_A \approx 2\phi_A \Omega_A \approx 0 \tag{34}$$

which is a natural reduction of the NC constraint in (17). Noting that $\frac{1}{2}k_A$ can be defined as a derivative operator on S^2 , we can express

$$k_A \Omega_B \equiv 2 D_A \Omega_B \tag{35}$$

Also the trace over matrices can be replaced by the integral over z and $\bar{z}$ according to

$$\frac{1}{N+1} \text{Tr} \longrightarrow \int \frac{dz d\bar{z}}{\pi(1+z\bar{z})^2} \equiv \int_{z, \bar{z}} \tag{36}$$

We can now rewrite (33) as

$$\mathcal{S}[\eta^0] \approx -i\beta \epsilon_{ABC} \int_{z, \bar{z}} \eta^0 \phi_C \left(D_A \Omega_B^3 + (e_A^+ e_B^- - e_A^- e_B^+) \right) \tag{37}$$

Similar results can be obtained for the rest of η 's. With a simple arrangement of notation, (37) and the analogous formulae for the other η 's, we recover the commutative action

$$\mathcal{S} \sim \epsilon_{AB} \int_{z, \bar{z}} \eta F_{AB} \quad (38)$$

This is the two-dimensional Jackiw-Teitelboim action on S^2 [12]. We have therefore checked that, in the large N limit, the gravitational action (24) on NC S^2 does reduce to the commutative one.

5 Generalizations

Eventhough we have derived the matrix action (24) via our defintions $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, the final result is simple and can be interpreted more directly. The key quantity that enters in the action is the combination $L_A + \mathcal{A}_A^a I^a$. We can write this as

$$\begin{aligned} L_A + \mathcal{A}_A^a I^a &= D_A^a I^a \equiv D_A \\ D_A^0 &= 2L_A + \mathcal{A}_A^0 \\ D_A^a &= \mathcal{A}_A^a, \quad a \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The key ingredient is thus a set of $(N \times N)$ hermitian matrices D_A^a . The definition of the curvatures is seen to be

$$\begin{aligned} [D_A, D_B] &= [D_A^a I^a, D_B^b I^b] = i\epsilon_{ABC} D_C^c I^c + F_{AB}^c I^c \\ &= i\epsilon_{ABC} D_C^c + F_{AB}^c \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= -i\frac{\alpha}{2} \text{Tr} \left[I^3 \eta \epsilon^{ABC} (D_C F_{AB} + F_{AB} D_C) \right] \\ &= -2i\alpha \text{Tr} \left[I^3 \eta \left(\epsilon^{ABC} D_A D_B D_C - iD^2 \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The constraint on the the D 's is $D_A D_A = L_A L_A$. It is only in this constraint that the restriction to the sphere arises. Notice that for this particular case, we could absorb the factor of I^3 inside the trace into the field η .

The general structure is as thus follows. We start with an irreducible finite dimensional representation of the Lie algebra of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ given by the I^a with the commutation relation $[I^a, I^b] = if^{abc} I^c$. (Specifically, here $f^{abc} = \epsilon^{abc}$ for $a, b, c = 3, \pm$ and zero otherwise.) We then construct the combinations $D_A = D_A^a I^a$ where the D_A^a are hermitian arbitrary matrices of some given dimension N . Using the same $SU(2)$ structure constants we define the curvatures by $F_{AB} = [D_A, D_B] - if_{ABC} D_C$. This does not make any reference to the

sphere yet. We restrict to the sphere by imposing the constraint $D_A D_A = L_A L_A$. The action is then constructed in terms of F_{AB} as in (41).

We can use this to generalize to $SU(3)$, which will apply to the case of gravity on noncommutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$. Let I^a , $a = 1, 2, \dots, 8$ be a set of (3×3) -matrices forming a basis of the Lie algebra of $SU(3)$, with the commutation rules $[I^a, I^b] = if^{abc} I^c$. We include $I^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \mathbf{1}$ to make up the algebra of $U(3)$. Let L_A denote an irreducible representation of the $SU(3)$ algebra in terms of $(N \times N)$ -matrices, with $[L_A, L_B] = if_{ABC} L_C$. The dynamical variables are then given by D_A^a which are a set of arbitrary $(N \times N)$ -matrices. (There are 72 matrices since $A = 1, 2, \dots, 8$ and $a = 0, 1, \dots, 8$.) The curvatures are defined by $F_{AB} = [D_A, D_B] - if_{ABC} D_C$, $D_A = D_A^a I^a$. As the constraints to be obeyed by the D 's we choose

$$\begin{aligned} D_A D_A &= L_A L_A \\ d_{ABC} D_B D_C &= c D_A \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where c is some constant and $d_{abc} = \text{Tr}(I_a I_b I_c + I_a I_c I_b)$ upto a constant normalization factor. The continuum limit of these conditions are well known as giving $\mathbf{CP}^2$ as an algebraic surface in $\mathbf{R}^8$. It has also been noted that they can give noncommutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$ [13]. Following the construction of the action given in [6] and our general discussion in section 3, we can write the action for gravity on $\mathbf{CP}^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= \alpha \text{Tr} \left[I^8 (D_A F_{KL} F_{MN} + F_{KL} F_{MN} D_A) \right] f_{KLB} f_{MNC} d_{ABC} \\ &= \alpha \text{Tr} \left[I^8 \left(D_A \{ [D_K, D_L] - if_{KLR} D_R \} \{ [D_M, D_N] - if_{MNS} D_S \} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \{ [D_K, D_L] - if_{KLR} D_R \} \{ [D_M, D_N] - if_{MNS} D_S \} D_A \right) \right] f_{KLB} f_{MNC} d_{ABC} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

This action, along with the constraints (42), gives gravity on noncommutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$ as a matrix model. One can also check directly that the large N limit of this will reduce to the MacDowell-Mansouri version of the action for gravity on commutative $\mathbf{CP}^2$.

It is clear that similar actions can be constructed for all $\mathbf{CP}^n$. Notice that the quantity $f_{KLB} f_{MNC} d_{ABC}$ is the fifth rank invariant of $SU(3)$. For $\mathbf{CP}^n$ we can use n factors of F 's and one factor of D and then contract indices with $\omega^{A_1 \dots A_{2n+1}}$, the invariant tensor of $SU(n+1)$ with rank $(2n+1)$. Thus

$$\mathcal{S} = \alpha \text{Tr} \left[I^{((n+1)^2-1)} \left(D_{A_1} F_{A_2 A_3} F_{A_4 A_5} \dots + F_{A_2 A_3} F_{A_4 A_5} \dots D_{A_1} \right) \right] \omega^{A_1 \dots A_{2n+1}} \quad (44)$$

In the large N limit, such an action will contain the Einstein term (in the MacDowell-Mansouri form), but will also have terms with higher powers of the curvature. The action (44) has to be supplemented by suitable constraints on the D 's, which may also be taken as (42) [15].

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by NSF grant number PHY-0070883 and by a PSC-CUNY grant.

Note added: In a recent paper [14], the analogue of the Euler number for NC S^2 is defined using Ginsparg-Wilson type operators. The density for this index reduces to the form $(L_A + A_A)F_{BC}\epsilon_{ABC}$ in the large N limit, similar to what we have used in place of the curvature in the action (24). However, in [14], only a $U(1)$ type field is considered, while we have a $U(2)$ field which can lead to the torsion-free condition as an equation of motion. We thank Professor Balachandran for discussions on this point.

Appendix

The operators k_A in section 4 are defined as follows.

$$\{\phi_A, \Omega_B\} = (1 + z\bar{z})^2(\partial\phi_A\bar{\partial}\Omega_B - \bar{\partial}\phi_A\partial\Omega_B) \equiv k_A\Omega_B$$

$$\begin{aligned} k_+ &= 2(z^2\partial + \bar{\partial}) \\ k_- &= -2(\partial + \bar{z}^2\bar{\partial}) \\ k_3 &= 2(z\partial - \bar{z}\bar{\partial}) \end{aligned}$$

These satisfy the following properties.

$$\begin{aligned} k_+\phi_+ &= 0 & k_+\phi_- &= 4\phi_3 & k_+\phi_3 &= -2\phi_+ \\ k_-\phi_+ &= -4\phi_3 & k_-\phi_- &= 0 & k_-\phi_3 &= 2\phi_- \\ k_3\phi_+ &= 2\phi_+ & k_3\phi_- &= -2\phi_- & k_3\phi_3 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\left[\frac{k_+}{2}, \frac{k_-}{2}\right] = 2\frac{k_3}{2}, \quad \left[\frac{k_3}{2}, \frac{k_+}{2}\right] = \frac{k_+}{2}, \quad \left[\frac{k_3}{2}, \frac{k_-}{2}\right] = -\frac{k_-}{2}$$

Notice that $\frac{1}{2}k_A$ form an $SU(2)$ algebra.

References

- [1] see for example, M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev.Mod.Phys. **73** (2001) 977-1029, hep-th/0106048; J. A. Harvey, hep-th/0102076; A.P. Balachandran, hep-th/0203259, and references therein.
- [2] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 5112; N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and A. Tsuchiya, Nucl. Phys. B **498** (1997) 467.

- [3] For a recent review, see W. Taylor IV, Rev.Mod.Phys. **73** (2001) 419-462, hep-th/0101126.
- [4] A. Chamseddine, G. Felder and J. Fröhlich, Commun. Math. Phys. **155** (1993) 205; W. Kalau and M. Walze, J. Geom. Phys. **16** (1995) 327; D. Kastler, Commun. Math. Phys. **166** (1995) 633; A. Chamseddine and A. Connes, Commun. Math. Phys. **186** (1997) 731.
- [5] A.P. Balachandran, T.R. Govindarajan and B. Ydri, hep-th/9911087, hep-th/0006216.
- [6] V.P. Nair, hep-th/0112114, to be published in Nucl. Phys. B.
- [7] F. Mansouri and L. N. Chang, Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 3192; S. MacDowell and F. Mansouri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 739; F. Mansouri, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 2456.
- [8] A.H. Chamseddine, hep-th/0202137; S. Cacciatori *et al*, Class. Quant. Grav. **19** (2002) 4029; M. Banados, *et al*, hep-th/0104264; J. Moffat, hep-th/0007181, hep-th/0008089; P-M. Ho, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12** (1997) 923; N.A. Viet and K.C. Wali, hep-th/0212062.
- [9] B. Morariu and A.P. Polychronakos, Nucl. Phys. **B610** (2001) 531; **B634** (2002) 326.
- [10] D. Karabali, V.P. Nair and A.P. Polychronakos, Nucl. Phys. **B627** (2002) 565.
- [11] V.P. Nair, Phys.Lett. **B 505** (2001) 249-254.
- [12] R. Jackiw and C. Teitelboim in *Quantum Theory of Gravity*, S. Christensen, ed. (Adam Hilger, Bristol, UK) (1987); for a more recent review and update, see R. Jackiw, gr-qc/9511048.
- [13] V.P. Nair and S. Randjbar-Daemi, Nucl. Phys. **B533** (1998) 333; H. Grosse and A. Strohmaier, hep-th/9902138; G. Alexanian *et al*, hep-th/0103023.
- [14] A.P. Balachandran and G. Immirzi, hep-th/0301242.
- [15] A.P. Balachandran *et al*, hep-th/0107099.